



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/041,141	01/03/2002	Radhika Aggarwal	RSW920010112US1 (007)	2419
46320 7590 10/14/2008 CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP STEVEN M. GREENBERG 950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE SUITE 3020 BOCA RATON, FL 33487				
EXAMINER				
HUYNH, THU V				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2178				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/14/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/041,141

**Applicant(s)**

AGGARWAL ET AL.

**Examiner**

THU V. HUYNH

**Art Unit**

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG/US)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed on 7/28/08 to application filed on 01/03/2002.
2. Claim 11 is currently added.
3. Claims 1-5, 11 are pending in the case. Claim 1 is independent claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

(b) This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1- 5, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Radtke et al., US 2002/0113810 A1, filed 12/22/2000, Hartman, US 6,615,226 B1, filed 09/1997, Jeffries et al., US 6,094,529, filed 12/1996 as supplied by the Applicants in IDS filed 01/03/2002, and “Instant HTML”, Homer et al., copyright 1997, pages 88-101.

Regarding independent claim 1, Radtke teaches the steps of:

- detecting in a form-based submit, at least one validation error based upon a value provided through an input-element in a markup specified form (Radtke, [0019]-

- [0022]; user enters data to fields of an internet web page form and submits the form, validating entered data in submitted form to detect invalid data);
- selecting error text corresponding to said validation error and inserting said selected error text approximate to the data field (Radtke, page 2, TABLE 1; [0017], [0019]-[0022], appropriate error text message among multiple error text message is provided according to the error type); and
  - serving said markup specified form in a response to said form-based submit (Radtke, [0022]).

Radtke does not explicitly disclose inserting a row in said markup specified form in a position which is proximate to said input element and said row having a background color which differs from other colors which a visible in proximity to said inserted row; inserting an anchor tag in said markup specified form in a position which is proximate to said input element; and in a response to said form-based submit, said response referring said anchor tag.

Hartman teaches inserting a row in said markup specified form in a position which is proximate to said input element (Hartman, col.9, lines 55-59; displaying error message on the line below to the data entry field that contains the error).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hartman and Radtke to provide the error message in different positions proximate to the error input element to inform the user of error, since below or/and next is one form of proximate position.

Jeffries teaches error message is highlighted, such as by underlining, changing the background color to provide a visual indicator (Jeffries, col.3, lines 33-36 and col.5, lines 24-33)

and displaying error messages with hyperlinks that provide more information describing the error to the user when the user selects one of the hyperlinks (Jeffries, col.7, lines 1-16; error message includes anchor tag with “href” attribute to link to more information).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Jeffries’ visual indicator in error message into Radtke’s error message in web page form to insert error text message having a background color which differs from other colors which a visible in proximity to said insert error text as well as a link, since this would have provided a visual indicator for the user to focus on erroneous field in the html form as well as hyperlink that provides more detail about the error for the user. It is also noted that highlighting error data or error text field in a web page form as a visual indicator for the user re-entries the data was well known in the art at the time the invention was made.

Homer teaches including an anchor tag with “name” attribute within a page so that, when we load the page, that part of the document is automatically scrolled into view (Homer, page 88, “Anchors Within A Page” section; placing the anchor tag with “name” attribute “dalmation” in section Dalmatians to directly scroll to that section when the page dog.html is loaded).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Homer’s teaching into Jeffries, Hartman and Radtke’s teaching to insert an anchor tag with “name” attribute beside “href” attribute to the error message when redisplay the form to inform the user that errors occur, since this would have automatically scrolled into the error area for the user enters a correct data as Homer’s disclosed above. This would have facilitated the user to re-enter the data when the error field is directly provided.

**Regarding claim 2**, which is dependent on claim 1, Radtke teaches inserting an error marker adjacent to said input-element (Radtke, [0017]). However, Radtke does not explicitly disclose inserting an error image adjacent to said input-element.

Jeffries teaches insert a glyph near highlighting text error message to provide a visual indicator (Jeffries, col.3, lines 33-36 and col.5, lines 24-33).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Jeffries' glyph visual indicator in error message into Radtke's error message in html form to insert a image/glyph near the error text message, since this would have provided a visual indicator for the user to focus on erroneous field in the html form.

**Regarding claim 3**, which is dependent on claim 1, Radtke, Jeffries, Hartman and Homer teaches display error message proximate to said input element (error field) as explained above. However, Upton does not explicitly disclose determining whether said markup specified form contained multiple views, one of said multiple view containing said input-element and if it is determined that said markup specified form contains multiple views, identifying said one of said multiple views and setting said identified one of said multiple views to a visible status

Hartman teaches a markup specified form contained multiple views, one of said multiple view containing said input-element (error field) (Hartman, col.9, lines 38-59).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hartman's teaching and Radtke's teaching to includes the steps of determining said markup specified form contains multiple views, identifying said one of said multiple views and setting said identified one of said multiple views to a visible status, since

this would have allowed error message to be displayed proximity to error field in both simple or/and complex form which contains multiple view to inform error for the user re-entries, since

**Regarding claim 4**, which is dependent on claim 1, refer to claim 1, the limitation of “inserting an error message row in said markup specified form in a position which is proximate to but below said input element, said error message row having a background color which differs from other colors which are visible in proximity to said inserted row” is included. The rationale is incorporated herein.

**Regarding claim 5**, which is dependent on claim 4. Refer to the rationale relied to reject claim 1, Radtke, Jefferies, Hartman and Homer teach inserting an anchor tag in said markup specified form in a position which is proximate to said input element. Homer also teaches the anchor tag place before the section to be automatically displayed (Homer, page 97, “Using Anchors in Your Pages” section).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Homer’s teaching into Radtke’s redisplay form to insert an anchor tag in the html form in a position which is proximate but before to said input element, since placing the anchor tag before the error section would have allowed the error part of the web page form is automatically scrolled into view as Homer’s disclosed above for the user enter a correct data as. This would have facilitated the user to re-enter the data when the error field is directly provided.

**Regarding claim 11**, which is dependent on claim 1, refer to claim 1, the combination of Radtke, Jeffries, Hartman teaches the anchor tag is inserted after detecting the at least one validation error and prior to serving said markup specified form (Jeffries, fig.4; col.7, lines 1-16; inserting links to error messages, wherein each link is an anchor tag with “href” attribute). The rationale is incorporated herein.

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed 07/28/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue with respect to claim 1 that "Applicants are unclear as to where Hartman specifically teaches that a row is inserted in the markup specified form. Hartman teaches that the Web page is generated with the error message in close proximity, but Hartman fails to teach how" (Remarks, page 5, second paragraph).

This is not persuasive. Hartman teaches user enters data in various data entry fields that are displayed in fig.8B (Hartman, col.9, lines 46-50) and “during the data entry, if an error is detected, when a Web page is generated with the error message in close proximity (e.g., on the line below) to the data entry field that contains the error” (Hartman, col.9, lines 54-59). Since, Hartman teaches displaying error message on the line bellow the error field in fig.8A, this inherently discloses that a row is inserted in the web page in order to overlap the error message to entry field bellow the entry field that contains the error.



Applicants argue that “Examiner’s other statement fails to provide a realistic motivation to modify Radtke in view of Hartman to arrive at the claimed invention since providing the error message, irrespective of where the error message is located, is able ‘to inform the user of the error’” (Remarks, page 6, first paragraph).

This is not persuasive. Both Radtke and Hartman teach displaying error message approximate to the data field to inform the user of the error, wherein Radtke’s error message is displayed next to the data field that contains the error and Hartman’s error message is displayed below to the data field that contains the error field. The combination of Hartman and Radtke would have informed the user the error message (next or below) the data field that contains the error before the user goes to the next data field in the form to enter data.

Applicants argue with respect to claim 11 that “the insertion of the anchor tag described by Homer occurs, presumably, when the HTML document/link is first created. On the contrary, the claimed invention recites that the anchor tag is inserted after detecting the at least one validation error and prior to serving said markup specified form” (Remarks, page 6, last paragraph).

However, Jeffries teaches anchor tag is inserted after detecting the at least one validation error and prior to serving said markup specified form as explained in the rejection above.

### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record, listed on PTO 892 provided to Applicant is considered to have relevancy to the claimed invention.

Applicant should review each identified reference carefully before responding to this office action to properly advance the case in light of the prior art.

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **THU V. HUYNH** whose telephone number is (571)272-4126. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Thu Huynh/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178  
October 7, 2008